arXiv:1510.01429v1 [math.CO] 6 Oct 2015

Distance-2 MDS codes and latin colorings in the Doob graphs*

Denis S. Krotov, Evgeny A. Bespalov

Abstract

The maximum independent sets in the Doob graphs $D(m,n)$ are analogs of the distance-2 MDS codes in Hamming graphs and of the latin hypercubes. We prove the characterization of these sets stating that every such set is semilinear or reducible. As related objects, we study vertex sets with maximum cut (edge boundary) in $D(m,n)$ and prove some facts on their structure. We show that the considered two classes (the maximum independent sets and the maximum-cut sets) can be defined as classes of completely regular sets with specified 2-by-2 quotient matrices. It is notable that for a set from the considered classes, the eigenvalues of the quotient matrix are the maximum and the minimum eigenvalues of the graph. For $D(m,0)$, we show the existence of a third, intermediate, class of completely regular sets with the same property.

Keywords: Doob graph, maximum independent set, maximum cut, MDS code, latin hypercube, equitable partition, completely regular set

1 Introduction

In this paper, we characterize the maximum independent sets in the Doob graphs. The Doob graph $D(m,n)$, as a distance-regular graph, has the same parameters as the Hamming graph $H(2m+n,4)$. As we will see, the maximum independent sets in the Hamming graphs share many properties with those sets in the Doob graphs.

*The work was funded by the Russian Science Foundation (grant No 14-11-00555).

The maximum independent sets in the Hamming graphs are studied in different areas of mathematics. In coding theory, they are the distanse-2 MDS codes (these codes do not correct any errors, but they are used in the construction of codes with larger code distance). In combinatorics, these sets are known as the latin hypercubes, multidimentional generalizations of the latin squares, which correspond to the case $n = 3$ (one of the coordinate is usually considered as dependent from the others). In nonassociative algebra, an n-ary quasigroup is exactly a pair of a set and an n-ary operation over this set whose value table is a latin hypercube. Every maximum independent set in a Hamming graph is a completely regular code of radius 1; the nontrivial eigenvalue of this code is the minimum eigenvalue of the graph.

For fixed q, the class of the distanse-2 MDS codes in $H(N, q)$ is described for $q \leq 4$. For $q \leq 3$, the description is rather simple as for each n there is only one such set, up to equivalence. In the case $q = 4$, there are $2^{2^{n+o(N)}}$ nonequivalent MDS codes in $H(N, 4)$; however, there is a constructive descriprion of the class of these codes [7]. Notably, the case $q = 4$ is a special case for the Hamming graphs $H(N, q)$ from the point of view of algebraic combinatorics: $H(N, 4)$, $N \geq 2$ are the only Hamming graphs that are not defined as distance-regular graphs with given parameters. The distance-regular graphs with the same parameters as $H(N, 4)$ are the Doob graphs $D(m, n)$, $2m + n = N$.

The main goal of the current research is to extend the characterization theorem [7] for the distanse-2 MDS codes in $H(n, 4) = D(0, n)$ to the maximum independent sets in $D(m, n)$ with $m > 0$. The characterization theorem is formulated in Section 4 and proven in Section 6.

As an intermediate result, in Section 5 we prove a connection between properties of related objects, 2×MDS codes, which can be defined as the sets with largest edge boundary (see Subsection 7.1). This result also generalizes its partial case $m = 0$, considered in [6].

In Section 7, we consider alternative definitions of MDS and 2×MDS codes in Doob graphs. In particular, we show that these two classes can be characterized in terms of equitable 2-partitions with quotient matrices whose nontrivial eigenvalue is the minimum eigenvalue of the graph. In $D(m, 0)$, we construct an equitable partition that has intermediate parameters between MDS and 2×MDS codes (strictly speaking, the quotient matrix of a new equitable partition is the arithmetic average of two quotient matrices corresponding to an MDS code and to a 2×MDS code). The existence of such "intermediate" objects between MDS and 2×MDS codes is a new effect,

which has no analogs in Hamming graphs.

The next two sections contain preliminaries and auxiliary facts.

2 Preliminaries



Figure 1: The Shrikhande graph drown on a torus; the vertices are identified with the elements of Z_4^2

The *Shrikhande graph* Sh is the Cayley graph of the group Z_4^2 with the connecting set $\{01, 10, 11, 03, 30, 33\}$ (the vertices of the graph are the elements of the group Z_4^2, which will be denoted 00, 01, 02, 03, 10, ..., 33; two vertices are adjacent if and only if their difference belong to the connecting set) see Fig. 1. The complete graph $K = K_4$ of order 4 is the Cayley graph of the group Z_2^2 with the connecting set $\{01, 10, 11\}$. The Cartesian product of m copies of Sh and n copies of K_4 will be denoted by $D(m, n)$. This graph is called a *Doob graph* if $m > 0$, while $D(0, n)$ is a 4-ary *Hamming graph*. Note that $D(m, n)$ is a Cayley graph of $(Z_4^2)^m \times (Z_2^2)^n$, with the corresponding connecting set.

Given a graph G, by ${}_{\rm v}G$ we denote its set of vertices. Two subsets of ${}_{\rm v}G$ are said to be *equivalent* if there is a graph automorphism that maps one subset to the other.

An independent set of vertices of maximal cardinality, i.e. 4^{2m+n-1}, in $D(m, n)$ is called a distance-2 MDS code (the independence number $4^{2m+n-1} = |{}_{\rm v}D(m, n)|/4$ follows easily from the independence numbers 4 and 1 of Sh and K, respectively). The two inequivalent MDS codes in $D(1, 0)$ are shown in Fig. 2.

Lemma 1. *If a subgraph G of $D(m, n)$ is isomorphic to a Doob graph (with smaller parameters), then the intersection of an MDS code with ${}_{\rm v}G$ is an MDS code in G.*



Figure 2: All MDS codes in Sh, up to isomorphism



Figure 3: All latin colorings of the Shrikhande graph, up to isomorphism

A function $f : {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m,n) \to {}_{\mathrm{v}}K_4$ is called a *latin coloring* if the preimage of every value is an MDS code; i.e., no two neighbour vertices have the same colors. In the case $m = 0$, the latin colorings are known as the *latin hypercubes* (if $n = 2$, the *latin squares*) of order 4. The case $m = 1$, $n = 0$ is illustrated in Fig. 3.

The *graph*[1] $\{(y_1, ..., y_m, x_1, ..., x_n, x_0) \mid x_0 = f(y_1, ..., y_m, x_1, ..., x_n)\}$ of a latin coloring f is always an MDS code. Inversely, any MDS code in $D(m, n+1)$ is a graph[1] of a latin coloring of $D(m,n)$ (however, the MDS codes in $D(m,0)$ cannot be represented in such a manner). Moreover, if f and f' are latin colorings of $D(m,n)$ and $D(m',n')$, then the set

$$\{(\bar{y}, \bar{y}', \bar{x}, \bar{x}') \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m'+m, n'+n) \mid f(\bar{y}, \bar{x}) = f'(\bar{y}', \bar{x}')\} \qquad (1)$$

is an MDS code in $D(m'+m, n'+n)$. If $2m+n > 1$ and $2m'+n' > 1$, then the MDS code (1) is called *reducible*, as well as all codes obtained from it by coordinate permutation.

A set M of vertices of $D(m,n)$ is called a $2\times$*MDS code* (two-fold MDS code) if every Shrikhande subgraph of $D(m,n)$ intersects with M in 8 vertices that form two disjoint MDS codes in Sh (see Fig 4) and every clique of order 4 contains exactly 2 elements of M. A union of two disjoint MDS codes is always a $2\times$MDS code; such a $2\times$MDS code will be called *bipartite*. The complement ${}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m,n)\backslash M$ of any $2\times$MDS code M is also a $2\times$MDS code, which will be denoted by $\overline{M}$. However, it is not known if the complement of any bipartite $2\times$MDS code is also a bipartite $2\times$MDS code (the known solution [8] for $D(0,n)$ is far from being easy).

[1]We will use this footenote mark to separate this notion from another meaning of the word "graph" (a pair of a set of vertises and a set of edges).

(a)  (b)  (c) 

Figure 4: All 2×MDS codes in the Shrikhande graph, up to isomorphism

A connected component of a subgraph of $D(m,n)$ induced by a 2×MDS code M will be called a *component* (of M). A 2×MDS code is called *connected* if it is a component itself. The union of (one or more) components of the same 2×MDS code will be referred to as a *multicomponent*.

A 2×MDS code is called *decomposable* (*indecomposable*) if its characteristic function can (cannot) be represented as a modulo-2 sum of two $0,1$-functions in disjoint nonempty collections of variables. It follows that these functions are the characteristic functions of 2×MDS codes in Doob graphs, which, in their turns, can be decomposable or not. As a result, the characteristic function of any 2×MDS code is a sum of the characteristic functions of one, two, or more (up to $m+n$) indecomposable 2×MDS codes. It is easy to see that, with some natural assumptions, such a representation is unique:

Lemma 2. *The characteristic function χ_M of any 2×MDS code $M \subset {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m,n)$ has a unique representation in the form*

$$\chi_M(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \equiv \chi_{M_1}(\tilde{x}_1,\tilde{y}_1) + \ldots + \chi_{M_k}(\tilde{x}_k,\tilde{y}_k) + \sigma \bmod 2 \qquad (2)$$

where

- $\bar{x} = (x_1,...,x_m) \in \mathrm{Sh}^m$;
- $\bar{y} = (y_1,...,y_n) \in K^n$;
- $\tilde{x}_i = (x_{j_{1,1}},...,x_{j_{i,m_i}}) \in \mathrm{Sh}^{m_i}$, $i = 1,...,k$;
  $m = \sum_1^k m_i$;
  $\{1,...,m\} = \{j_{1,1},...,j_{1,m_1},\ldots,j_{k,1},...,j_{k,m_k}\}$;
- $\tilde{y}_j = (y_{l_{i,1}},...,y_{l_{i,n_i}}) \in K^{n_i}$, $i = 1,...,k$;
  $n = \sum_1^k n_i$;
  $\{1,...,n\} = \{l_{1,1},...,l_{1,n_1},\ldots,l_{k,1},...,l_{k,n_k}\}$;

- *for all* $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$ *it holds* $m_i + n_i \geq 1$ *and* M_i *is an indecomposable* $2\times$*MDS code not containing the all-zero tuple;*
- $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$.

Obviously, an $2\times$MDS code M is decomposable if and only if $k > 1$ in the representation (2).

3 Linear $2\times$MDS codes and semilinear MDS codes

We will say that a $2\times$MDS code is *linear* if $k = m + n$ in the representation (2), i.e., all M_i are $2\times$MDS codes in Sh or K, and, moreover, the ones that are in Sh are not connected (Fig. 4(a)). It is easy to see that all linear $2\times$MDS codes in a given $D(m, n)$ are equivalent.

We will say that an MDS code is *semilinear* if it is a subset of a linear $2\times$MDS code. In the rest of this section, after auxiliary statements, we evaluate the number of semilinear MDS codes. We omit the proof of the next lemma as it is obvious.

Lemma 3. *Let a characteristic function* χ_M *of a decomposable* $2\times$*MDS code* M *has a decomposition*

$$\chi_M(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \equiv \chi_{M_1}(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{y}_1) + \chi_{M_2}(\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{y}_2) + \sigma \bmod 2$$

where each M_i, $i = 1, 2$, *as well as its complement, has* N_i *components. Then* M, *as well as its complement, has* $2N_1N_2$ *components.*

Lemma 4. *Let* M *be a* $2\times$*MDS code in* $D(m, n)$, *and let* N *be the number of components in* M.

a) If M *is a linear* $2\times$*MDS code then* $N = 2^{2m+n-1}$.

b) If M *is bipartite, then the number of MDS codes included in* M *is* 2^N.

Proof. a) The statement follows by induction from Lemma 3.

b) As follows from the hypothesis, the subgraph D_M of $D(m, n)$ induced by M is bipartite. By the definition of an MDS code, a part of D_M is an MDS code. To choose a part of D_M, one should independently choose one of two parts of every connected components of D_M. So, the number of ways is 2^N. ▲

Lemma 5. *The number of linear* $2\times$*MDS codes in* $D(m, n)$ *is* $2 \cdot 3^{m+n}$.

PROOF. Every linear 2×MDS codes can be represented as (2) where for each $i \in \{1, 2, ..., k = m + n\}$ the set M_i is a 2×MDS code in Sh equivalent to the one in Fig. 4(a) or a 2×MDS code in K and, moreover, $00 \notin M_i$. In any case, M_i can be chosen in 3 ways. Since σ can be chosen in 2 ways, we have totally $2 \cdot 3^{m+n}$ ways to specify a linear 2×MDS code. ▲

Lemma 6. *The number of semilinear MDS codes in $D(m, n)$ is $2 \cdot 3^{m+n} \cdot 2^{2^{2m+n-1}}(1 + o(1))$ as $m + n \to \infty$.*

PROOF. There are $2 \cdot 3^{m+n}$ linear 2×MDS codes (Lemma 5), each including $2^{2^{2m+n-1}}$ semilinear MDS codes (Lemma 4). It remains to understand that almost every semilinear MDS code is included in only one linear 2×MDS code. One of simple explanations of this fact is that two different linear 2×MDS codes M', M'' can include at most one common MDS code. Indeed each of M', M'' is a coset of a subgroup of $(Z_4^2)^m \times (Z_2^2)^n$, so the cardinality of their intersection cannot be larger than $|M'|/2 = |M''|/2 = 4^{2m+n-1}$, which is the cardinality of an MDS code. ▲

4 Main results

We are now ready to formulate the main result of the paper, which will be proven in the next two sections.

Theorem 1. *Every MDS code in $D(m, n)$ is semilinear or reducible.*

Note that 'or' is not 'xor' here; a reducible MDS code (1) can also be semilinear. This happens when both graphs[1] of f and f' are semilinear and, moreover, the representations (2) of the corresponding linear 2×MDS codes have the same summand $\chi_{M^*}(x_0)$ corresponding to the dependent variable x_0 (M^* can be $\{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$, $\{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$, or $\{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$, but it is the same for both f and f').

Corollary 1. *The number of MDS codes in $D(m, n)$ has the form*

$$2 \cdot 3^{m+n} \cdot 2^{2^{2m+n-1}}(1 + o(1)) \qquad \text{as} \quad m + n \to \infty.$$

PROOF. By Lemma 6, the number of semilinear MDS codes is $2 \cdot 3^{m+n} \cdot 2^{2^{2m+n-1}}(1 + o(1))$. The number of reducible MDS codes is asymptotically inessential compairing with this value (see, e.g., [9]). ▲

5 A key proposition

In this section, we will prove the following proposition, which will be used in the proof of the main theorem.

Proposition 1. *A 2×MDS code in $D(m,n)$, $(m,n) \neq (1,0)$, is decomposable if and only if it is not connected.*

The following fact is easy to check directly.

Lemma 7. *Let M and M' be two 2×MDS codes in* Sh. *Then, either M and M' coincide, or they are are disjoint (i.e., $M \cup M' = {}^{\mathrm{v}}\mathrm{Sh}$), or every component of M intersects with every component of M'.*

The following partial case of Proposition 1 will be used as an auxiliary statement.

Lemma 8. *A 2×MDS code M in $D(m,n)$, $m+n=2$, is decomposable if and only if it is not connected.*

Proof. By Lemma 3 every decomposable 2×MDS code is not connected, which is the 'only if' part of the statement. For the 'if' part, we have to show that any 2×MDS code M in $D(m,n)$, $m+n=2$, is decomposable or connected.

The case of $D(0,2) = K \times K$ is trivial, as there are only two nonequivalent 2×MDS codes, one is decomposable, the other is connected.

The case of $D(1,1) = \mathrm{Sh} \times K$ is also simple. Denote $M_y = \{x \in {}^{\mathrm{v}}\mathrm{Sh} \mid (x,y) \in M\}$ for each $y \in {}^{\mathrm{v}}K$. Then M_y is a 2×MDS code in Sh. If for all y', y'' from ${}^{\mathrm{v}}K$ the sets $M_{y'}$ and $M_{y''}$ are either coinciding or disjoint, then, readily, M is decomposable. Assume that for some y', $y'' \in {}^{\mathrm{v}}K$ the sets $M_{y'}$ and $M_{y''}$ are neither coinciding nor disjoint. By Lemma 7, the corresponding 16 vertices of M belong to the same component. Moreover, for every y from ${}^{\mathrm{v}}K$, the set M_y is neither coinciding nor disjoint with at least one of $M_{y'}$, $M_{y''}$. It follows that M is connected.

It remains to consider the case of $D(2,0) = \mathrm{Sh} \times \mathrm{Sh}$. For $a \in \mathrm{Sh}$, denote

$$R_a = \{x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh} \mid (a,x_1) \in M\} \quad \text{and} \quad aR_a = \{(a,x_1) \in M\},$$
$$L_a = \{x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh} \mid (x_1,a) \in M\} \quad \text{and} \quad L_a a = \{(x_1,a) \in M\}.$$

Consider the case when L_{00} is equivalent to the 2×MDS code in Fig. 4(a) (the other two cases are considered similarly); without loss of generality, assume $L_{00} = \{00,01,02,03,20,21,22,23\}$. Now consider the component

$\{00, 01, 02, 03\}$ of L_{00}. If $R_{00} = R_{01} = R_{02} = R_{03}$, then for every a from Sh, the set $\{00, 01, 02, 03\}$ is a component of L_a or $\overline{L}_a$; hence, by Lemma 7, $L_a = L_{00}$ or $\overline{L}_a = L_{00}$. In this case, readily, M is decomposable. So, without loss of generality we can assume that R_{00} and R_{01} are different. Since they intersect, Lemma 7 means that $00R_{00}$ and $01R_{01}$ lie in a one component of M. Since R_{01} and R_{02} intersect, $02R_{02}$ lies in the same component; similarly, $03R_{03}$. By similar arguments, each of $S_0 = 00R_{00} \cup 01R_{01} \cup 02R_{02} \cup 03R_{03}$, $S_1 = 10R_{10} \cup 11R_{11} \cup 12R_{12} \cup 13R_{13}$, $S_2 = 20R_{20} \cup 21R_{21} \cup 22R_{22} \cup 23R_{23}$, $S_3 = 30R_{30} \cup 31R_{31} \cup 32R_{32} \cup 33R_{33}$ is a subset of a component of M, and it remains to show that this component is common for all the four sets. For example, let us show that it is common for S_0 and S_1. Indeed, since R_{00} and R_{01} are different, R_{11} intersects with at least one of them; this means that there is an edge connecting $00R_{00} \cup 01R_{01}$ and $11R_{11}$. Similarly, there are edges connecting S_1 and S_2, S_2 and S_3. We conclude that M consists of one component. ▲

Lemma 9. *Let M be a 2×MDS code in $D(m, n)$, let L be its multicomponent, and let L_1 be the set of vertices of $D(m, n)$ at distance 1 from L. Then L_1 is a multicomponent of $\overline{M}$.*

Proof. Clearly, L_1 is a subset of $\overline{M}$. It remains to show that for each $b \in L_1$ every $c \in \overline{M}$ adjacent to b also belongs to L_1. By the definition of L_1, there is $a \in L$ adjacent to b. Assume that a and b differ in the ith coordinate, while b and c differ in the jth coordinate.

(*) We will show that *there is $d \in L$ adjacent to c and differing from c in the ith coordinate*. If $i = j$ is a K-coordinate, then this claim is obvious (we can take $d = a$). If $i = j$ is a Sh-coordinate, then it is also easy to see. Assume $i \neq j$ and consider the subgraph D (isomorphic to $D(0, 2)$, $D(1, 1)$, or $D(2, 0)$) corresponding to these two coordinates and containing the vertices a, b, and c. Let M' be the intersection of M with this subgraph. We know that M' is a 2×MDS code in D and hence, by Lemma 8, it is connected or decomposable. In the first case, $M' \subseteq L$ and (*) is trivial. In the last case, the vertex d coinciding with c in all coordinates except the ith one and coinciding with a in the ith coordinate must belong to L (indeed, from the decomposability we have $\chi_{M'}(a)+\chi_{M'}(b)+\chi_{M'}(c)+\chi_{M'}(d) = 0 \bmod 2$, hence $d \in M'$; since d and a are adjacent, we also have $d \in L$).

So, (*) holds, and L_1 consists of components of $\overline{M}$. ▲

Lemma 10. *Let M be a 2×MDS code in $D(m, n)$ where $m > 0$. Let, for*

some $a_2, ..., a_m \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}\mathrm{Sh}$ *and* $b_1, ..., b_n \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}K$,

$$M' = \{(x_1, a_2, ..., a_n, b_1, ..., b_m) \in M \mid x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh}\}.$$

Then either all elements of M' *belong the same component of* M *or* M *is decomposable and*

$$\chi_{M'}(x_1) + \chi_{M_0}(x_2, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_m) \bmod 2 \tag{3}$$

for some $2\times$*MDS code* M_0.

Proof. For $\alpha = (\alpha_2, ..., \alpha_m) \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}\mathrm{Sh}^{m-1}$ and $(\beta_1, ..., \beta_n) \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}K^n$, denote $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \{x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh} \mid (x_1, \alpha_2, ..., \alpha_m, \beta_1, ..., \beta_n) \in M\}$. Clearly, $M_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a $2\times$MDS code in Sh. If $M_{a,b}$ is connected, where $a = (a_2, ..., a_m)$, $b = (b_1, ..., b_n)$, then, obviously, M' lies in a component of M and the statement holds. Assume that $M_{a,b}$ is not connected and, moreover, M' intersects with two components of M. Without loss of generality, suppose $00 \notin M_{a,b}$. Define the $2\times$MDS code $M_0 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid (00, \alpha, \beta) \notin M\}$; in particuar, $(a, b) \in M_0$. Our goal is now to prove (3).

Let L_0 be the component of M_0 that contains (a, b). For every $(a', b') \in M_0$ adjacent to (a, b) we have $M_{a',b'} = M_{a,b}$ (otherwise, by Lemma 7, M' lies in one component, contradicting our assumption). Similarly, $M_{a',b'} = M_{a,b}$ for every (a', b') from L_0. Define recursively, L_{i+1} as the set of vertices of $D(m-1, n)$ at distance 1 from L_i, $i = 0, 1, ...$ Since L_0 is a component of M_0 and $M_{a',b'} = M_{a,b}$ for every (a', b') from L_0, we have $M_{a'',b''} = \overline{M}_{a,b}$ for every (a'', b'') from L_1. By Lemma 9, L_1 is a multicomponent, and we can apply the same argument to get $M_{a',b'} = M_{a,b}$ for every (a', b') from L_2. Similarly, $M_{a',b'} = M_{a,b}$ for every (a', b') from L_4, L_6, L_8, ... and $M_{a'',b''} = \overline{M}_{a,b}$ for every (a'', b'') from L_3, L_5, L_7, ... It is easy to see that every vertex of M_0 (of $\overline{M}_0$) belongs to L_i for some even (odd, respectively) i. It follows that (3) holds. ▲

Lemma 11 ([6, Corollary 4.2, Remark 4.3]). *Let* $G = K_q^n$ *be the Cartesian product of* n *copies of the complete graph* K_q *of even order* q. *Let* M *be the set of vertices of* G *such that every clique of order* q *contains exactly* $q/2$ *elements of* M. *Then either the subgraph* G_M *of* G *induced by* M *is connected, or the characteristic function* χ_M *of* M *is decomposable into the sum* $\chi_M(z) = \chi_{M'}(z') + \chi_{M''}(z'') \bmod 2$, *where* $M' \subset {}_{\mathrm{v}}K_q^{n'}$, $M'' \subset {}_{\mathrm{v}}K_q^{n''}$, *and* z', z'' *are nonempty disjoint collections of variables from* $z = (z_1, ..., z_n)$ *of length* n' *and* n'' *respectively,* $n' + n'' = n$.

Lemma 12. *Let $G^* = G^*(m,n) = K_{16}^m \times K_4^n$ be the Cartesian product of m copies of the complete graph K_{16} of order 16 and n copies of the complete graph K_4 of order 4. Let M^* be the set of vertices of G^* such that every clique K maximal by inclusion (it follows that $|K| = 4$ or $|K| = 16$) contains exactly $|K|/2$ elements of M. Then either the subgraph $G^*_{M^*}$ of G^* induced by M^* is connected, or the characteristic function χ_{M^*} of M^* is decomposable into the sum $\chi_{M^*}(z) = \chi_{M'}(z') + \chi_{M''}(z'') \bmod 2$, where $M' \subset {}_{\mathrm{v}}G^*(m',n')$, $M'' \subset {}_{\mathrm{v}}G^*(m'',n'')$, and z', z'' are nonempty disjoint collections of variables from $z = (x_1,...,x_m,y_1,...,y_n)$.*

Proof. We map each vertex $(x_1,...,x_m,y_1,...,y_n)$ of G^* to 4^n elements $(x_1,...,x_m,(y_1,z_1),...,(y_n,z_n))$, $z_i \in \{0,1,2,3\}$, $i = 1,...,n$, which will be treated as vertices of K_{16}^{m+n}. Then M^* is mapped into a set M of vertices of K_{16}^{m+n}. It is easy to see that M satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 11. Moreover, the subgraph G_M is connected if and only if the subgraph $G^*_{M^*}$ is connected; and the characteristic function χ_M is decomposable if and only if χ_{M^*} is decomposable. Then, the statement follows from Lemma 11. ▲

Proof of Proposition 1. Assume that M is a 2×MDS code in $D(m,n)$. If M is connected, then it is indecomposable by Lemma 3.

Assume that M induces a disconnected subgraph of $D(m,n)$. Since $K_{16}^m \times K_4^n$ is obtained from $D(m,n)$ by adding some edges, the subgraph of $K_{16}^m \times K_4^n$ induced by M can be connected or not.

If M induces a disconnected subgraph of $K_{16}^m \times K_4^n$, then the statement follows from Lemma 12.

It remains to consider the case when the subgraph of $K_{16}^m \times K_4^n$ induced by M is connected. This means that some Shrikhande subgraph of $D(m,n)$ intersects with two components of M (then, adding the absent edges in this subgraph connects these two components). But then M is decomposable by Lemma 10. ▲

6 Proof of the main theorem

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider an MDS code C in $D(m,n)$, $m > 0$. For $\alpha = (\alpha_2,...,\alpha_m) \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}\mathrm{Sh}^{m-1}$ and $\beta = (\beta_1,...,\beta_n) \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}K^n$, denote $C_{\alpha,\beta} = \{x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh} \mid (x_1,\alpha_2,...,\alpha_m,\beta_1,...,\beta_n) \in C\}$.

Assume that for all α and β the MDS code $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ is equivalent to the code shown in Fig. 2(a), i.e., one of $C_{00} = \{00,02,20,22\}$, $C_{01} = \{01,03,21,23\}$,

$C_{10} = \{10, 12, 30, 32\}$, $C_{11} = \{11, 13, 31, 33\}$. Then, it is easy to see that C is reducible:

$$C = \{(y, \bar{y}', \bar{x}') \in D(m, n) \mid f(y) = f'(y', x')\}$$

for some $f' : {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m-1, n) \to \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ and for $f : {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(1, 0) \to \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ satisfying $f(y) = ij$ for every $y \in C_{ij}$.

Otherwise, we may assume without loss of generality that $C_{a,b} = \{00, 02, 21, 23\}$ (Fig. 2(b)) for some a and b. To utilize Proposition 1, we consider the 2×MDS code $M = C \cup (C + (01, 00, ..., 00))$. We will see that it is decomposable. Define the 2×MDS code $M_0 = \{(x_2, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_n) \mid (00, x_2, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_n) \in C$ or $(01, x_2, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_n) \in C\}$. In particular, $(a, b) \in M_0$. Similarly to $C_{\alpha,\beta}$, we denote $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \{x_1 \in \mathrm{Sh} \mid (x_1, \alpha_2, ..., \alpha_m, \beta_1, ..., \beta_n) \in M\}$. In particular, $M_{a,b} = \{00, 01, 02, 03, 20, 21, 22, 23\}$ (Fig. 4(a)).

For every $(a', b') \in M_0$ at distance 1 from (a, b), the MDS code $C_{a',b'}$ contains 01 and, moreover, is disjoint with $C_{a,b} = \{00, 02, 21, 23\}$. There is only one such code, $C_{a,b} = \{01, 03, 20, 22\}$. It follows that $M_{a',b'} = \{00, 01, 02, 03, 20, 21, 22, 23\} = M_{a,b}$. Similarly, $M_{\alpha,\beta} = M_{a,b}$ for all (α, β) from the same connected component of M_0 as (a, b). Then, for all (α, β) at distance 1 from this connected component, we have $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \overline{M}_{a,b}$. Using Lemma 9 and applying the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 10, we see that for all (α, β) at even distance from the considered component we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in M_0$ and $M_{\alpha,\beta} = M_{a,b}$, while for odd distance, $(\alpha, \beta) \notin M_0$ and $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \overline{M}_{a,b}$. It follows that $\chi_M = \chi_{M_{a,b}}(x_1) + \chi_{M_0(x_2,...,x_m,y_1,...,y_n)} + 1 \bmod 2$.

So, we have that C is included in a decomposable 2×MDS code M. Let (2) be the decomposition of M into indecomposable 2×MDS codes M_i, $i = 1, ..., k$, $k \geq 2$. By Proposition 1, all M_i are connected, except some 2×MDS codes in Sh, which are equivalent to the code in Fig 4(a). Assume without loss of generality that the first m' 2×MDS codes M_1, ..., $M_{m'}$ are not connected and that they correspond to the first m' variables x_1, ..., $x_{m'}$. Since M includes at least one MDS code C, all M_i, $i = 1, ..., k$ are bipartite, as well as their complements. It follows that for each i there is a latin coloring $f_i : {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(n_i, m_i) \to {}_{\mathrm{v}}K$ such that $M_i = \{z \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(n_i, m_i) \mid f_i(z) \in \{10, 11\}\}$. Define the linear 2×MDS code L by

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_L(x_1, ..., x_{m'}, z_1, ..., z_{k-m'}) \;=\; & \chi_{M_1}(x_1) + \ldots + \chi_{M_{m'}}(x_{m'}) \\ & + \chi_{\{10,11\}}(z_1) + \ldots + \chi_{\{10,11\}}(z_{k-m'}) + \sigma.\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward that

$$M = \{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in {}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m, n) \mid (x_1, ..., x_{m'}, f_{m'+1}(\tilde{x}_{m'+1}, \tilde{y}_{m'+1}), ..., f_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k)) \in L\}.$$

Then, for every MDS code $S \subset L$, the MDS code

$$\{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in {}_{\mathrm{V}}D(m,n) \mid (x_1, ..., x_{m'}, f_{m'+1}(\tilde{x}_{m'+1}, \tilde{y}_{m'+1}), ..., f_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k)) \in S\} \quad (4)$$

is a subset of M. Since L and M consist of the same number of components, they include the same number of MDS codes. In particular, C is also representable in the form (4) for some S. If $m' = m$ and $k = m + n$, then C is semilinear. Otherwise, $k < m + n$ or $k = m + n$ and $m' < m$, and C is reducible. ▲

7 MDS codes and 2×MDS codes as sets with extremal properties

We already know that the MDS codes in a Doob graph are exactly the maximum (by cardinality) independent sets (actually, we take this property as the definition of the MDS codes). In this section, we show that the 2×MDS codes also meet some extremal property. Namely, they are exactly the sets with maximum edge boundary (cut). Moreover, the MDS codes and the 2×MDS codes define equitable 2-partitions of the Doob graph with minimum eigenvalue.

7.1 The maximum cut

The *edge boundary* (also known as *cut*) of a set V of vertices of a graph $G = ({}_{\mathrm{V}}G, {}_{\mathrm{E}}G)$ is the set of edges $\{\{v, w\} \in {}_{\mathrm{E}}G \mid v \in V, w \notin V\}$.

Proposition 2. *(a) The maximum size of the edge boundary of a vertex set in $D(m,n)$ is $(2m+n)4^{2m+n}$. (b) A vertex set M has the maximum edge boundary if and only if it is a 2×MDS code.*

Proof. It is straightforward from the definition that a 2×MDS code has the edge boundary of size $(2m+n)4^{2m+n}$. It remains to show the upper bound for the statement a) and the 'only if' part of b).

(a) $(2m+n)4^{2m+n}$ is 2/3 of the total amount of edges in $D(m,n)$. Since $D(m,n)$ is the Cartesian product of several copies of the Shrikhande graph Sh and several copies of the complete graph K of order 4, it is sufficient to show that the number of boundary edges in each of these two graphs cannot be larger than 2/3 of the total amount of edges, i.e., $\frac{2}{3} \cdot 48 = 32$ in the case of Sh and $\frac{2}{3} \cdot 6 = 4$ for K. For K, this is trivial. For Sh, this follows from the



Figure 5: There is a cycle of type 4:0



Figure 6: There is a cycle of type 3:1

fact that each triangle (complete subrgaph of order 3) cannot have more than 2 boundary edges, while every edge belong to the same number of triangles.

(b) We first note that it is sufficient to prove the statement for the graphs Sh and K. Indeed, if we have a set M whose edge boundary size is 2/3 of the total amount of edges in $D(m, n)$, then the same proportion takes plase in every Shrikhande or K subrgaph (otherwise, there is a contradiction with p.(a) for such subgraphs). If we already have the statement for Sh and K, then M is a 2×MDS code by the definition.

For K, it is trivial. Let us consider the Shrikhande graph and a vertex set M with edge bound of size 32. We color the vertices of M by black and the other vertices by grey. From the previous paragraph we know that each triangle has at least one black and one grey vertex; we will always keep this fact in mind in the rest of the proof. The Shrikhande graph has 12 induced (i.e., without chords) 4-cycles. We consider three cases.

(4:0) There is an induced cycle colored into one color. Then, the colors of the other vertices are uniquely reconstructed (see Fig 5), leading to the situation shown in Fig. 4(a).

(3:1) There is a induced cycle with only one black vertex or only one grey vertex. The colors of six other vertices are uniquely reconstructed. Choosing the color of any of the six remaining vertices uniquely leads to one of two mutually symmetric colorings, see Fig 6. The result corresponds to Fig. 4(b).

(2:2) All induced cycles have two black and two grey vertices. Then, there is an induced cycle containing two neighbour black vertices, see Fig 7. Four vertices out of this cycle are uniquely colored. Choosing the color of any of the eight other vertices and using only the hypothesis of the case (2:2), we uniquely color the seven remaining vertices, see Fig 7. Both M and its



Figure 7: All cycles are of type 2:2

complement are equivalent to the set shown in Fig. 4(c). ▲

7.2 Equitable partitions

A partition $(P_1, ..., P_r)$ of the vertex set of a graph into r nonempty cells is said to be an *equitable partition*, see e.g. [4, 9.3] (regular partition [1, 11.1B], partition design [2], perfect coloring [3]), if there is an $r \times r$ matrix $(s_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{n}$ (the *quotient matrix*) such that for every i and j from 1 to r every vertex from P_i has exactly $s_{i,j}$ neighbors from P_j. It is known that each eigenvalue of the quotient matrix is an eigenvalue of the graph [1] (in a natural way, an eigenvector of the quotient matrix generates an eigenfunction of the graph). If the graph is regular, then its degree is always an eigenvalue of the quotient matrix.

The graph $D(m, n)$ has the $2m+n+1$ eigenvalues $-2m-n$, $-2m-n+4$, $\ldots$, $6m+3n$. In ${}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m, n)$, we consider an equitable 2-partition $(C, \overline{C})$ such that the quotient matrix has two eigenvalues $-2m-n$ and $6m+3n$ (the smallest and the largest eigenvalues of $D(m, n)$). This matrix has the form $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a & 3d-a \\ a+d & 2d-a \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ for some a from 0 to $2d$. The cases $a = 0$, $a = d$, and $a = 2d$ correspond to C being an MDS code, a 2×MDS code, and the complement of an MDS code.

Proposition 3. *a) A 2-partition $(C, \overline{C})$ of ${}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m, n)$ is equitable with the quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 6m+3n \\ 2m+n & 4m+2n \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ (or $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 4m+2n & 2m+n \\ 6m+3n & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$) if and only if C (respectively, $\overline{C}$) is an MDS code. b) A 2-partition $(M, \overline{M})$ of ${}_{\mathrm{v}}D(m, n)$ is equitable with the quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 2m+n & 4m+2n \\ 4m+2n & 2m+n \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ if and only if M is a 2×MDS code.*

Proof. We will use the formula $|S| = \frac{c}{b+c}|{}_{\mathrm{v}}G|$ for the cardinality of the first cell S of an equitable partition of a graph G with the quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right]$.

a) For the first matrix, we have $a = 0$; so, C is an independent set. Counting its cardinality gives the cardinality of an MDS code. For the second matrix, similar argument works for $\overline{C}$.



Figure 8: An equitable 2-partition with quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}1 & 5\\ 3 & 3\end{smallmatrix}\right]$

b) Count the size $|M| \cdot b$ of the edge boundary and apply Proposition 2. ▲

However, the cases $a = 0$, $a = d$, and $a = 2d$ are not all possible cases. In $D(m, 0)$ (i.e., $d = 2m$), the cases $a = 0.5d$ and $a = 1.5d$ are also feasible; that is there exists an equitable partition with the quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}m & 5m\\ 3m & 3m\end{smallmatrix}\right]$. The first ($m = 1$) such partition is shown in Fig. 8.

Proposition 4. *Let $(C, \overline{C})$ be the partition shown in Fig. 8. Then*

$$\left(\left\{(x_1, ..., x_n) \in {}^{\mathrm{v}}D(n, 0) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \in C\right\}, \left\{(x_1, ..., x_n) \in {}^{\mathrm{v}}D(n, 0) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \in \overline{C}\right\}\right)$$

is an equitable partition with the quotient matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}1m & 5m\\ 3m & 3m\end{smallmatrix}\right]$.

The proof is straightforward.

Remark. We breafly discuss another important concept related to the equitable partitions. A set S of vertices of a graph is said to be *completely regular* (often, a *completely regular code*) if the partition of the graph vertices with respect to the distance from S is equitable (the quotient matrix is tridiagonal in this case). The number of cells different from S in this partition is called the *covering radius* of S. Trivially, each cell of an equitable 2-partition is a completely regular set of covering radius 1. As shown in [5], using the Cartesian product, from every completely regular code of covering radius 1 one can obtain a completely regular code of arbitrary covering redius. It is interesting that a component of a decomposable 2×MDS code can be represented as the Cartesian product of k 2×MDS codes, where k is from (2). As follows from the results of [5], such a component is a completely regular code, if and only if all 2×MDS codes M_i, $i = 1, ..., k$ in the decomposition (2) have the same quotient matrices. This happens if and only if $2m_1 + n_1 = \ldots = 2m_k + n_k$.

8 Conclusion

We have proven a characterization of the distance-2 MDS codes (maximum independent sets) in the Doob graphs $D(m, n)$.

For related objects in $D(m, n)$, called the 2×MDS codes, we have proven the equivalence between the connectedness and the indecomposability. However, the problem of characterization of the 2×MDS codes (namely, those of them that cannot be split into two MDS codes) remains open. We have shown that the 2×MDS codes are exactly the sets with maximum cut (edge boundary).

We have noted that the MDS codes and the 2×MDS codes in $D(m, n)$ are the equitable 2-partitions with certain quotient matrices. The eigenvalues of these matrices are the minimum and the maximum eigenvalues of $D(m, n)$. We have found that in the case $n = 0$ there is a third class of equitable 2-partitions that corresponds to these eigenvalues. Characterizing all partitions from this class is also an interesting direction for further research.

9 Acknowledgements

The work was funded by the Russian Science Foundation (grant No 14-11-00555).

References

[1] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier. *Distance-Regular Graphs*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[2] P. Camion, B. Courteau, and P. Delsarte. On r-partition designs in Hamming spaces. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.*, 2(3):147–162, 1992. DOI: 10.1007/BF01294330.

[3] D. G. Fon-Der-Flaass. Perfect 2-colorings of a hypercube. *Sib. Math. J.*, 48(4):740–745, 2007. DOI: 10.1007/s11202-007-0075-4 translated from Sib. Mat. Zh. 48(4) (2007), 923-930.

[4] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*. Springer, 2001.

[5] J. H. Koolen, W. S. Lee, and W. J. Martin. Arithmetic completely regular codes. E-print 0911.1826, arXiv.org, 2009. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0911.1826`.

[6] D. S. Krotov. On decomposability of 4-ary distance 2 MDS codes, double-codes, and n-quasigroups of order 4. *Discrete Math.*, 308(15):3322–3334, 2008. DOI: 10.1016/j.disc.2007.06.038.

[7] D. S. Krotov and V. N. Potapov. n-Ary quasigroups of order 4. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 23(2):561–570, 2009. DOI: 10.1137/070697331. arXiv:math/0701519

[8] V. N. Potapov. On extensions of partial n-quasigroups of order 4. *Sib. Adv. Math.*, 22(2):135–151, 2012. DOI: 10.3103/S1055134412020058 translated from Mat. Tr. 14(2):147-172, 2012.

[9] V. N. Potapov and D. S. Krotov. Asymptotics for the number of n-quasigroups of order 4. *Sib. Math. J.*, 47(4):720–731, 2006. DOI: 10.1007/s11202-006-0083-9 translated from Sib. Mat. Zh. 47(4) (2006), 873-887. arXiv:math/0605104